

SNOHOMISH COUNTY CONSERVATION FUTURES PROGRAM ADVISORY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MAY 01, 2013

3:00 – 6:00 P.M.

JACKSON BOARD ROOM

**8TH FLOOR, COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
MEETING MINUTES**

Members Present: City Councilmember Randy Lord (Large City Representative), Mayor Carla Nichols (Small City Representative), County Councilmember Dave Somers, County Councilmember Stephanie Wright, Ann Boyce (Community Representative), Brian Parry (County Executive Representative), Dan Bartelheimer (Community Representative)

Staff: Dianne Bailey (Park Property Administrator, Snohomish County Department of Parks and Recreation); Sharon Swan (Senior Park Planner, Snohomish County Department of Parks and Recreation) David McConnell (Planning Assistant, Snohomish County Department of Parks and Recreation); Geoffrey Thomas (Legislative Analyst – Operations, Snohomish County Council); Sara Di Vittorio (Snohomish County Deputy Prosecuting Attorney)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson

Chairman Somers called the May 1st regular meeting of the Conservation Futures Program Advisory Board (CFPAB) to order at 3:08 p.m.

2. INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS

Board

3. REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MIINUTES

Board

- January 15th 2013 – Randy Lord moved to accept the minutes as written. Motion seconded by Carla Nichols. Motion carried 5/0.
- April 2nd 2013 – Randy Lord moved to accept the minutes as written. Motion seconded by Carla Nichols. Motion carries 5/0.

4. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE REQUEST 101 BOARD TRAINING

Sara Di Vittorio

Staff Presentation – Sara Di Vittorio:

- Overview of the Public Records Act

- CFPAB is considered an agency under the act and board members are required to provide responsive documents upon request to Public Records Officer Dianne Bailey.
- Email accounts used by Board members are subject to public disclosure when they are used for CFPAB business.
- For board members who are not also county officials or staff, options are being considered to provide email accounts specifically for board business and communication.

Board Member Questions:

- Question on Sara's example – does everyone have to provide the same documents for a request? Answer – the documents that are responsive depend on the wording of the request. If a request has 'all' or 'any and all' in it, then everyone may need to provide documents, not just the sender or receiver.
- How long do records need to be kept and what are the penalties for records that are not provided? Answer – records are kept according to county policy and the state schedule of records retention. Liability for failure to turn over documents can be up to \$100 per document per day until the document(s) are provided. Temporary documents do not need to be kept long term. Specific examples were discussed.
- When a county employee is part of the 'to:' list, board member can assume that the employee(s) will retain emails.

5. BOND ISSUE FOR OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION FROM CONSERVATION FUTURES FUND Dianne Bailey

Dianne Bailey provided a brief update on the bond:

- Bond was sold on April 24th 2013
- Funding is now in a secure account
- Revenue available for the program totals 25 million dollars
- Ready to proceed with the application process

6. CONSERVATION FUTURES BOND FUNDED PROJECT MAP Dianne Bailey

Dianne Bailey presented the map of past bond funded acquisitions up to the 2012 request for the bond. The map showed the property acquisitions from the beginning of the program through 2012. The Board agreed that the map was helpful and requested that the map be updated and brought to future meetings. Staff agreed to provide an updated map.

7. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED APPLICATION PROCESS Sharon Swan

Sharon Swan presented information on the proposed application process, proposed schedule, and revised application rating system.

- Schedule – overview of application process and timing of key points in the process
- Application – changes made per board recommendations
- Scoring matrix – reviewed how the draft scoring matrix works using test projects and make further adjustments per board recommendations
- Scoring Practice – Board members worked through the evaluation and scoring process using two mock examples

Board Discussion & Feedback

- Dianne Bailey discussed the need to limit grant awards going to nonprofits to 5% or less of the total bond; this limitation is structured to meet the standards set forth in **IRS Private Letter Ruling 200502012**. Dianne also discussed the need to ensure that private businesses do not profit from the public bond.
- Discussion on how to use the ranking criteria and adjustments to be made.
- The Board prefers to score the project proposals as a set once all presentations have been made.
- Item number 9 removed from matrix because it is a duplicate.
- Discussion on the term 'willing seller' vs. 'interested seller'. The board prefers the latter, but concerns remain regarding the short timeline and the effect of drawn out negotiations on the three year deadline to spend all of the bond funds.
- Discussion on the scored question regarding whether or not projects will provide public access for 'public use and enjoyment'?
- Discussion of weighting criteria and possible adjustments.
- Add item 11 – combination of unique opportunity and high threat of development. Item should read "Please describe how this project represents a unique or special opportunity" and remove previous language.
- Presentations – include summary and background, why this is an important project, highlights of the project. Presentations should be limited to 5 minutes, can be either Power Point or posters, no pre-screening by staff as the board would like to hear all projects. Seller may be present if interested.

8. PROJECT UPDATES – 2011 AWARDS

Dianne Bailey

Dianne Bailey gave the board a brief update on the following projects from the 2011 grant round:

- Ellingson – appraisal will be completed soon. The purchase & sale agreement are anticipated to be delivered to the County Council in 60 – 90 days.
- Japanese Gulch – funds have been banked and there is \$800,000 in fund so far. Sponsor is expected to be back in the next round for more funds.
- Harbor View Park Addition – the sponsor is currently in negotiations with BNSF.
- Stanwood – the Inter-local Agreement went to the County Council on April 11th and was approved.
- Forterra – the grant agreements for both projects are going to its board for signatures.
- Dashiell – environmental assessment ordered, still need to do appraisal.
- Heybrook – environmental assessment ordered, appraisal in process.
- Darrington – ILA has been through County Council, acquisition in process

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

Board

The board discussed special meeting times to review anticipated grant applications and identified tentative meeting dates in November. A specific meeting date and time was not set for the next regular meeting in January.

10. COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Board

None

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.